



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/743,970

12/23/2003

Gino Tanghe

920522-95345

9404

23644 7590 05/18/2010
BARNES & THORNBURG LLP
P.O. BOX 2786
CHICAGO, IL 60690-2786

EXAMINER

HOLTON, STEVEN E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2629

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/18/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Patent-ch@btlaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/743,970	Applicant(s) TANGHE ET AL.	
	Examiner Steven E. Holton	Art Unit 2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 January 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18, 20 and 23-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18, 20 and 23-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is made in response to applicant's amendment filed on 1/19/2010. Claims 1-18, 20, and, 23-26 are currently pending in the application. An action follows below:

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see pages 8-9, filed 1/19/2010, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-18, 20, and 23-26 under 35 USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of newly considered prior art.

The applicant's have argued that the term 'setting the emissive devices' is specifically intended to read on setting operating parameters of a display device rather than setting of driving signals. The Examiner will agree to this interpretation and assume that 'setting the emissive devices' is limited to only setting operating parameters of emissive devices and not with setting of image signals of emissive devices. As such, the previously applied reference of Greene discusses setting of image signals rather than of operating parameters.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 17, and, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Greene et al. (USPN: 6,292,157), hereinafter Greene.

Regarding claims 1 and 24, the claims are drawn to a method of operating a display device and control unit for performing the operation and are considered together. Greene discloses a tiled large screen emissive display (Figs. 3, 4, 5, and 6, element 20; col. 2, lines 30-42 state that LCD is used as a generic term to describe flat-panel displays including emissive and transmissive displays). Greene discloses the tiled display having multiple subdivisions (Figs. 3-6, elements 22) and each of these display tiles possess emissive devices in the form of individual pixels (col. 2, lines 36-38). Greene discloses a method of operating the device of setting the operating parameters of the emissive devices to be optimized to produce a target value of equivalent color across the entire display tile (col. 3, lines 4-16; 31-42; and 60-65). The target value is the value that allows the display to operate having "total color purity throughout a tiled LCD display (col. 4, lines 3-4). First a display device is manufactured and the emissive devices of each tile are set to meet the target value for the individual tile (col. 3, lines 4-16; 31-42; and 60-65; col. 5, lines 39-46; col. 6; lines 1-36). Then, Greene optimizes the entire tiled display by producing a set of parameters that are

transmitted to each of the first subdivisions to produce a display that provides a standard image for the entire tiled display taking into account the individual characteristics of each of the displays (col. 5, lines 54-60; col. 6, lines 1-52). The control of the parameters is performed by the controller circuitry (Figs. 2-5, element 12 and sometimes element 26). So, Greene discloses forming a tiled display device having multiple tiles each having individual emissive devices, and setting the operational parameters of the display devices of each of the emissive devices to achieve a tiled display having uniform color characteristics for the entire display.

Regarding claim 4, Greene discloses the first subdivision is an emissive tile (Fig. 3, element 22; col. 2, lines 30-42).

Regarding claims 7 and 8, Greene discloses setting the elements of the tiled display to operate at the same target output level (Fig. 9b, element 92 shows the corrected output curve of multiple tiles each having multiple emissive devices; the displays are shown to have essentially the same output for all of the emissive devices so the Examiner reads this as being within a .8% performance of the target value; col. 3, lines 38-42 notes that changes between levels from one tile to another are to be kept to about 1% of performance of each other which; the Examiner interprets 0.8% as being about 1%).

Regarding claim 17, Greene discloses adjusting control parameters that were previously stored (col. 6, lines 9-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2, 35, 6, 9, 10, 18, 20, 23, 25, and, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greene.

Regarding claims 2, 3, and 25, as discussed above Greene discloses a method of setting the operation parameters of a display device for a tiled display to operate the display at a target value. Greene also discloses using two levels of parameter balancing with a different level of consideration (col. 6, lines 33-36).

At the time of invention it would have been logically obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the method of matching groups of tiles disclosed by Greene could be expanded to include further groups of tiles. The rationale would be to scale a method of correction of multiple display elements for larger and larger groups of display elements. It would be logically obvious that two tiled displays having multiple display tiles could be brought together to form a larger tiled display and recursively, the larger tiled display could be matched with another larger tiled display to produce even larger display devices. In such cases, the operational parameter settings for the smaller tiled display groups would then be further adjusted to match the parameters of other smaller tiled display groups to produce parameters for the entire larger tiled display. The further

Art Unit: 2629

adjustments to the smaller tiled displays would allow for color uniformity across the combined display and produce a larger display having acceptable color uniformity and visual output. Thus, it would have been obvious to extend the method of matching multiple display devices as described by Greene to match multiple groups of tiles to read on the limitations of claims 2 and 3.

Regarding claims 5 and 6, by grouping multiple emissive tiles together Greene would produce a display tile and by grouping multiple display tiles together Greene would produce a display supertile. It would be logically obvious that groups of tiles could be combined to form larger and larger groups of tiles and to finally produce a desired tiled display device made up of groups of groups of tiles.

Regarding claims 9 and 10, Greene discloses setting the elements of the tiled display to operate at the same target output level (Fig. 9b, element 92 shows the corrected output curve of multiple tiles each having multiple emissive devices; the displays are shown to have essentially the same output for all of the emissive devices so the Examiner reads this as being within a .8% performance of the target value; col. 3, lines 38-42 notes that changes between levels from one tile to another are to be kept to about 1% of performance of each other which; the Examiner interprets 0.8% as being about 1%). It would be logically obvious to set multiple groups of displays to be within 1% or each other so that the large tiled display having multiple groups of tiles would continue to have acceptable performance as a display device.

Regarding claims 18 and 20, Greene discloses calibrating the operating parameters of the display devices to calibrate the color purity of the display devices (col.

Art Unit: 2629

5, lines 42-46) and the use of electronic systems to perform the balancing of parameters (col. 6, lines 33-36). Greene does not expressly state using an adaptive algorithm, but it would be obvious to one skilled in the art as useful programming and would be a matter of design choice based on the speed of algorithms available vs. the amount of computer processing power and memory available for the entire system.

Regarding claims 23 and 26, Greene discloses the use of electronic systems and a controller circuit for performing the balancing of parameters (col. 6, lines 6-10 and 33-36). At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the electronic systems or circuit could be a processor running a program and the program could be stored on a computer readable medium or transmitted to the system over a communications network. The use of computer readable mediums and telecommunications networks is well known in the art of electronic systems and it would have been obvious to use a computer readable medium or communication system to transmit methods of operation of the electronic device to the tiled display system of Greene.

5. Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greene in view of Miller et al. (USPN: 7184067), hereinafter Miller.

Regarding claim 11, Greene discloses all of the limitations except, "wherein determining any or more of the first subdivision target value, second subdivision target value, the further subdivision target value and/or emissive display target value, an environmental parameter is take into account."

Miller discloses an electroluminescent display device (Fig. 3, element 28) where the operating parameters of the display device are modified by measuring an environmental parameter of the conditions outside of the display device (col. 8, lines 26-43).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Greene and Miller to produce a tiled display device with correction for environmental parameters. It would have been obvious to combine the tiled electroluminescent display of Greene with the ambient light measurement system described by Miller. The motivation would be to adjust the brightness of the display device based on the ambient light to improve the power consumption and lifespan of an organic electroluminescent display device (Miller, col. 10, lines 9-12). Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Greene and Miller to produce a method of operating a tiled display with environmental measurement as described in claim 11.

Regarding claim 12, Miller discloses measuring the temperature of a display device for modification of the output of the display device (col. 10, lines 20-22).

Regarding claim 13, Miller discloses that the temperature sensor can be inside the display device and outside the display device (col. 10, lines 20-22). A temperature sensor placed near a display device can only measure the ambient temperature surrounding the display device which is affected by the display device. Thus, by measuring the temperature outside of the display device the temperature of the display device can be estimated based on the measured ambient temperature.

Art Unit: 2629

Regarding claim 14, Miller discloses measuring the ambient illumination (col. 8, lines 26-43).

6. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greene in view of Cok et al. (USPN: 7161566), hereinafter Cok.

Regarding claims 15 and 16, Greene discloses all of the limitations except using an operating parameters comprising the age, or total ON time of any of the subdivisions of the emissive devices within the display device.

Cok discloses a method of adjusting and correcting the output of an electroluminescent display device based on the measurement of the age of the display device (abstract; col. 7, lines 18-26).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Greene and Cok. The calibration method of the Greene systems could be combined with calibration method dealing with aging of emissive devices of Cok. The rationale would be that aging of emissive elements or other operation parameters known to affect the display devices could be taken into consideration as part of the calibration of the display device. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Greene and Cok to produce a method and device as described in claims 15 and 16.

Art Unit: 2629

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven E. Holton whose telephone number is (571)272-7903. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (571) 272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Bipin Shalwala/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/Steven E Holton/
Examiner, Art Unit 2629
May 8, 2010